New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waldo, Secretary; J. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.54	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	3.52	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.79	One month	.25
One year	15.30	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

The First Step.

The Tribune believes that every Republican who desires to see the party victorious in the coming campaign recognizes the necessity for a prompt, frank and specific statement upon the Hyphen question by Mr. Hughes.

Whatever injury has been done by silence hitherto, there can be no question that continued silence will be fatal, since it is increasingly interpreted as consent to all that German-American leaders and newspapers are now asserting.

Sooner or later Mr. Hughes will have to speak. What consideration of personal or party interest can contribute to persistence in his present silence?

It is Woodrow Wilson, and not Theodore Roosevelt, whom Mr. Hughes must defeat, and Mr. Wilson's policies, not Mr. Roosevelt's, that he must attack.

Much has been sacrificed by previous silence, but there is still time to save much. Will Mr. Hughes permit this opportunity to pass? The Tribune hopes not.

The Allied Bazaar.

New York has seldom shown as much concerted generosity and good will as in making the present Allied Bazaar at the Grand Central Palace the huge success that it is. In their heartiness of spirit the crowds suggest the neighborly kindness of a small town, turned out *en masse* to help a good cause along.

There have been many stirring moments in the daily programmes, moments that made the bazaar itself, even the winning of an automobile or a necklace, tame enough. The war relics have done much—whether it be the Pegoud motor or a battered .75. But the spirit of those, great and small, who are working for the cause at stake has counted for even more. By no other token has it been granted to New York to enter so vividly into the spirit of France and her allies. To hear Mme. Calvé and her "*Aux armes, citoyens!*" is to touch hands with a great patriotism. He is a poor American who is not the better for sharing such a moment.

The Navy's Opportunity.

With Mr. Tillman's support the friends of a strong navy ought to have little difficulty in incorporating into the naval appropriation bill a provision for the construction of two new super-dreadnoughts. The House of Representatives failed recently by only six votes to overrule Chairman Padgett, who was willing to authorize five battle-cruisers, but was unwilling to continue battleship construction at the same time. As The Tribune said at the time the naval bill was reported, if it were necessary to choose absolutely between five battle-cruisers and two super-dreadnoughts, it would be better, with a view to rounding out the strength of our present navy, to take the five battle-cruisers. But it is not necessary to make such a choice. The country can afford to continue super-dreadnought construction, even though it begins to repair past errors by materially increasing the long neglected scouting strength of our fleets.

The battle of the Skagerrak did not show that the battle-cruiser had been overrated. The battle-cruiser's function is not to engage heavier armored battleships at close range. Unless taken at a disadvantage, its speed gives it the power to fix the conditions under which it will fight. Its value in action was fully demonstrated at the battle of the Falkland Islands and in the Dogger Bank engagement. Though itself highly susceptible of injury, it can also inflict great injury at long ranges, when sea conditions are favorable. In the Skagerrak battle, owing to mist and "low visibility," the battle-cruiser was abnormally handicapped! The ships of this class which were lost were doing a sort of close-in fighting for which they were never intended. It is unreasonable to expect them to go into the thick of a battle in which super-dreadnoughts are engaged.

Our navy is startlingly weak in vessels which can perform scout service. The five fast battle-cruisers and the four scout cruisers authorized in the House bill are sorely needed. By all means, let these authorizations stand. But the Senate is free to add two battleships to the list of 1916-'17 building programme. The battleship is still the great fighting unit on the seas. The last report of the General Board of the Navy, written in November, 1915, said of the super-dreadnought: "The conclusion to be drawn so far from the history of the current war is that the battleship is still the principal reliance of navies, as it has been in the past." There can be no dissent from this conclusion. It was emphasized once more—and most strikingly—in the battle of the Skagerrak.

If we are to have the second strongest navy in the world, now is the time to expand and expedite our construction. The German fleet is being diminished, its losses now exceeding its new construction. If it tries conclusions again with the British North Sea Fleet it will probably cripple itself for a decade. We can therefore increase our strength doubly by enlarging and speeding up our building programme.

The Senate should improve to the utmost the present exceptional opportunity to regain the rating in sea power which the United States lost four or five years ago through foolishly hearkening to the propaganda of pacifism and anti-preparedness.

The New Cabinet in Italy.

The demand for the formation in Italy of a War Cabinet representing all the political parties is a natural consequence of the partial success of the Austro-Hungarian drive in the Trentino. The Salandra Cabinet was able to hold on without difficulty so long as the deadlock on the northern front continued. But when the Austro-Hungarian armies threatened to descend into the Venetian plain the political situation suddenly changed. Popular sentiment demanded greater vigor, solidarity and unity of purpose in the conduct of the war, and naturally demanded changes in the ministry which would make the government representative of all the existing political elements.

There has been a party, taking its inspiration from ex-Premier Giolitti, which has been passively opposed to war with Germany and to a very vigorous prosecution of the campaign for the redemption of the Trentino and Trieste. This faction has had an influence disproportionate to its numbers. It wanted Italy to pursue a military policy of "watchful waiting." But with Venetia threatened such a programme is no longer tolerable to any Italian patriot, however inclined he may be to caution and to a very sparing expenditure of blood and treasure.

Russian victories on the Galician front and in Bukowina may relieve Austro-Hungarian pressure on Italy. But the Italian people have been aroused by an unexpected Austro-Hungarian offensive to a much clearer conception of the dangers of trying to play a waiting game and of conducting war with something less than the determination and energy of which a united nation is capable.

The new and broadened Cabinet will make for greater harmony and greater resolution in carrying the war to a decision. In this reorganization Italy is only following the example of France and Great Britain. The British Coalition Cabinet was formed as soon as it became apparent that it could do better work than the original Liberal Cabinet. France has reorganized her ministry twice, each time with good results. Even in autocratic Germany and Russia there have been important Cabinet changes. War imposes rude tests and compels many readjustments. Italy is only beginning to feel the pressure for ministerial reshufflings which military exigencies always create. It is a pressure far more beneficial than it is injurious. Italy will undoubtedly gain by a reorganization which will produce a Cabinet much more representative of the unified spirit of the Italian people.

No Presidential Interregnum.

The next Fourth of March falls on Sunday. This dislocation of our political calendar is bound to revive discussion of the old question whether or not there is an actual hiatus of a day between the end of the outgoing President's term and the beginning of the term of the incoming President, assuming that the latter defers taking the oath of office until March 5.

We have received letters from several correspondents who maintain that if the President elected for the term beginning March 4 next does not take the oath of office until noon of March 5 the holdover Secretary of State will be acting President during the thirty-six hour interval. That is a mistaken idea. There can be no legal hiatus between two Presidential terms unless Congress fails to declare the election of a new President until after the term of the President in office has expired. If a declaration of election has been made, the term of the President-elect must begin on March 4, no matter on what later date he may take the oath of office. Washington did not take the oath in 1789 until April 30. But his first four-year term expired on March 3, 1793.

A President is not restricted as to the exact hour at which he shall qualify. James Monroe qualified for his second term on March 5, 1821, March 4 being a Sunday. But Rutherford B. Hayes, whose term also began on Sunday, qualified on the evening of March 3, 1877.

The fanciful theory of an interregnum over a Sunday during which, under the existing succession law, the holdover Secretary of State becomes acting President, is completely disposed of in a letter, written on February 20, 1821, by Chief Justice John Marshall to John Quincy Adams, who was then Secretary of State. The chief justice had been asked to pass informally on the propriety of deferring Monroe's taking of the oath for his second term from March 4 to March 5. Prefacing his letter with the statement that he had conferred with the other justices, Marshall wrote:

> As the Constitution only provides that the President shall take the oath of office, it prescribes "before he enter on the execution of his office," and as the law is silent on the subject the time seems to be in some measure at the discretion of that high officer. There is an obvious propriety in taking the oath as soon as it can conveniently be taken, and thereby shortening the interval in which the executive power is suspended. But some interval is inevitable. The time of the actual President will expire, and that of the President-elect commence, at 12 in the night of the 3d of March. It has been usual to take the oath at midday on the 4th. Thus there has been uniformly and voluntarily an interval of twelve hours during which the executive power cannot be exercised. This interval may be unavoidably prolonged. Circumstances may prevent the declaration of the person who is chosen until it shall be too late to communicate the intelligence of his election until after the 4th of March. This occurred at the first election.

Undoubtedly, on any pressing emergency the President might take the oath in the first hour of the 4th of March; but it has never been thought necessary to do so, and he has always named such hour as he deemed most convenient. If any circumstance should render it unfit to take the oath on the 4th of March, and the public business would sustain no injury by its being deferred till the 5th, no impropriety is perceived in deferring it till the 5th. Whether the fact that the 4th of March comes this year on Sunday be such a circumstance may perhaps depend very much on public opinion and feeling. Of this, from our retired habits, there are few perhaps less capable of forming a correct opinion than ourselves. Might we hazard a conjecture, it would rather be in favor of postponing the oath till Monday, unless some official duty should require its being taken on Sunday. But others who mix more in society than we do can give conjectures on this subject much more to be confided in than ours.

It is plain from this interesting historical dictum that there is no sound authority for the claim that Mr. Lansing will become acting President for a day and a half, in case the next President-elect decides to take the oath of office not on March 4, but at noon of March 5.

Diphtheria and Antitoxin.

A wrong impression may easily be given by the summary of an inquiry lately undertaken by the Department of Health. It shows that while in the last ten years there has been a decline in the fatal cases of scarlatina and measles, for which there is no specific remedy, diphtheria remains stationary in spite of the widespread use of the antitoxin. The total numbers of cases reported annually are given as follows, beginning with the year 1907: 15,298, 16,431, 15,098, 16,940, 13,485, 13,553, 14,535, 17,130 and 15,279. The fatal cases in the same order were 1,740, 1,758, 1,714, 1,715, 1,281, 1,125, 1,333, 1,491 and 1,278.

It is evident that the result is not satisfactory, and, of course, the figures will be used by the anti-vaccinationists as a demonstration of the uselessness of antitoxin. The conclusion, however, is entirely unjustified. In the first place, it must be remembered that the antitoxin was not first introduced in 1907. It had done good service long before that. English statistics show in 1908 a case mortality of from 9 to 10 per cent, but if we look back fourteen years we find that the mortality was no less than 30 per cent. In Paris in the same period the mortality fell in about the same proportion, and, according to Loeffler's figures, the mortality throughout Germany has been reduced 50 per cent since the introduction of anti-diphtheritic serum.

Nothing is, indeed, more thoroughly established than the value of this treatment, and it would be a misfortune if the inquiry of the Department of Health were to be interpreted as reflecting upon it. The best results cannot, however, be expected unless the injection is made early and in sufficient quantity. This is the moral insisted upon by the Health Commissioner.

Pageantry and Patriotism.

(From The Boston Herald.)

In this Shakespearian time Boston has pageants seriously in its mind, and the American Pageant Association, by its discussions in this city, has done much to stimulate interest in a form of art which we have too long neglected. The pageant would be well worth while if it did no more than stir the feelings and quicken the imagination. Its educational value is considerable, and it serves to revive historical achievements which the world cannot willingly let die. Great events that have a personal appeal lend themselves well to outdoor representation. Give your hero a spectacular setting suited to his time, transfigure him with allurements of form, color and music, and you imprint his image in the popular memory more indelibly than can be achieved by any potency of oral teaching or of books.

We have already revived in this way the romance of new-world discovery, with Columbus as its pioneer; we have seen the achievement which dowered the planet with the art of printing thus magnified and beautified to make an American holiday. Only the other day, in one of our Eastern cities, it was found possible in a series of scenes to tell the whole story of human industry, from its beginnings in the cave man, whose tools were of stone, to its culmination in the magic of the steam engine and the dynamo. The pageant lends itself well to recalling the past. As wonder worker it clothes with life and movement the literary shapes which the masters of old put into their dramas, their stories and their poems. Why should it not tell of more recent happenings and of things less remote?

Where Rainfall Is Greatest.

(From The Hartford Courant.)

During the year 1915 the precipitation at Hartford amounted to 40.27 inches, a little short of the normal, which is 45.48. By way of contrast it is worth while to look at the report of the meteorologist at Hawaii for the month ended at midnight on April 30 for the sake of seeing what happens in a territory where rain is no novelty. It appears by that that the rainfall for April at the station at Honomu, District of South Hilo, was 44.44 inches, or a little more than four inches in excess of the total precipitation in Hartford for the year 1915. The total precipitation at that station in 1915 was 201.79 inches, or nearly seventeen feet. Considering that an inch of rain means the addition of 113 tons weight to a square acre, it can be seen that nature carried on an immense engineering feat at Honomu. Fifteen other stations on the island the precipitation for the year exceeded 100 inches, a fact which compels Hartford folk to wonder what the humans did during the fine imitation of the deluge. One reassuring feature appears in the report, and that is that at no station in Hawaii were there more than seven rainy days during the week ended April 30.

MR. HUGHES'S DUTY

He Is Urged to Speak Emphatically and Explicitly on the Hyphen.

From The Evening Sun.

One other obligation confronts the nominee, an obligation both moral and tactical. This is to put an end once and for all to the notion that he is in any way, shape or manner the supporter or the beneficiary of hyphenation. That Mr. Hughes will always treat the so-called German-American as an American we have no doubt. All citizens will look alike to him. He will be the President of all alike without prejudice or favor. But that he will extend any special privileges to any group on racial grounds is unbelievable; that he should even tolerate such privileges claimed for the sake of advantage to a foreign power is unthinkable. It is an insult and an injury beyond pardon to ascribe such an inclination to him. On this matter he should speak out at once. He cannot speak too explicitly or too emphatically.

From The Globe.

Expectations built on the hope that Mr. Hughes will cater to the hyphenate vote are likely to be disappointed. He is of the school of Lincoln Republicanism and understands what this country is and what it stands for. Here is no stuff for the manufacture of dual citizenship. The smiles on the faces of those who feel alien allegiance are likely to pass. Indeed, the propaganda carried on in behalf of Mr. Hughes by the professional pro-Germans was the one thing that jeopardized his nomination. The friends of President Wilson now look forward to appealing for support by pointing to the enemies he has made, but prudence suggests that they will be unwise if they rely too much on the strength of this plea.

Mr. Hughes has been silent because he deemed it his duty to avoid doing anything while on the Supreme Court that would seem to invite a nomination. But now that his lips are unsealed public curiosity will be abundantly satisfied.

From The World.

It is evident from the boasts of hyphenated newspapers and leaders that Mr. Hughes's nomination is celebrated as a triumph for German-Americans who take orders from Potsdam. They are at no pains to conceal their joy over the political victory won in the Coliseum. They have scrapped Theodore Roosevelt. They have disbarred Elihu Root from the Presidency. They have eliminated every candidate not bearing their indorsement and forced the Republican party to make Mr. Hughes its standard bearer.

A more serious question then presents itself. Are the American people next November to be subjected to the boast of the same people that they put their own candidate for President in the White House and expelled the President who did not shape the policies of the United States to fit the purposes of Berlin?

This is what the Kaiser's Germans in America say and are ready to say of Mr. Hughes. They beg everybody to note the fact that he is their man. No doubt they believe what they say in their numerous presses. There must be doubt for a season whether these hyphenates are Mr. Hughes's men. He alone can throw light on that subject.

Not a word in the Republican platform, which Mr. Hughes accepts with eagerness, defines the exact position of the Republican candidate or the Republican party on this question. It is a time-serving document, designed with intent not to stir the prejudices of the most sensitive or the most truculent German-American. It deals in vague phrases that dispel no old doubts and only raise new doubts. There is nothing anywhere in word or sentiment that the most cautious politician might not utter with his hand on his heart.

But the hyphenates have spoken. When are we to hear from the loyal American whom they have compromised?

From The Boston Daily Advertiser (Progressive).

In his telegram of acceptance Charles Evans Hughes attacks the problems of Americanism. His language is necessarily brief and therefore general in its terms, but it leaves no doubt as to Mr. Hughes's position. He declares himself squarely upon the Mexican situation, upon our European policy and upon preparedness. As he is notoriously a man who carries out to the letter every policy he declares, "The Advertiser" is confident that this statement is but the general outline of a more detailed declaration to follow, which will place Mr. Hughes as the leader of the anti-Wilson sentiment which has been so effectively created by Colonel Roosevelt. Such a declaration will bring with it the support that Colonel Roosevelt and the Progressives are only too ready to give to an effective leadership, and with that support a successful campaign is assured.

An Ibsen of the Celluloid?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Slowly but surely the art of the motion picture is coming into its own. As it grows in strength and power the former carping critics are hiding their faces in shame or endeavoring to find places on the band wagon of the movies. Some there are who still, to their own discredit, insist on docketing the new art as crude and plebeian, unfit to be considered in the same category with the drama of the stage or with literature. Crude and plebeian it has been, as were the early efforts of the novelists or the playwrights of a pre-Elizabethan stage. But it is gradually finding itself, and through such pictures as Sir Herbert Tree's "Macbeth" it will prove that it is not a cheap imitation of the stage, but a companion art, a new sister to Thespis. The closing words of your kindly editorial in especial aroused my admiration: "Not the elimination of the movie, but a better movie, is the goal which such an offering suggests. If it makes its spectators dissatisfied with weaker imaginings and poorer construction it will do more for the screen than a world of censorships."

But we who believe in the new art and who have devoted our life's work to its proper upbuilding look forward with longing eyes to the day when with serious endeavor and solemn purpose, instead of mocking amusement, our best poets and strongest thinkers will perpetuate their original imaginings on the screen and will receive a reward commensurate with the labor and thought involved; to the day when the photo-dramatist shall be considered worthy of the honors now bestowed alone upon the stage dramatist or the novelist. Then, perhaps, we shall receive with acclaim the Shakespeare of the screen, the Ibsen of the celluloid—a genius who will regard the motion picture as a proper medium for the expression of his greatest thoughts. HOWARD IRVING YOUNG.

New York, June 9, 1916.

Fighting Quakers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Wilmington, Del., sent many a Quaker to the front in the War of the Rebellion. One of them, Daniel Kent, was a captain in the regiment raised and commanded by my half-brother, the 4th Delaware, which had many other Quakers in it.

ROBERT GRIMSHAW.

New York, June 9, 1916.

"ARE WE STILL WINNING, WILHELM?"

HOW TO ENLIST AN ARMY

Short Term, with an Opportunity for Military Schooling, Advocated—Making Officers from the Ranks—A Defence of Class Spirit—The Attitude of Civilians Toward the Ex-Soldier.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Having carefully read your editorial "Making Army Service Worth While," in The Tribune of June 8, will you permit me to state my views on how to get and train the youth of this nation into a great army?

First, enlist men into the regular army for three years, with the right of an honorable discharge at the end of the first year's service. This would give the nation a body of men well trained and stop the thousands of desertions annually under the present plan of recruiting.

Should the recruit stay for the second and third years, increase his pay $5 a month for both years, payable when discharged. This would give him $120 cash, besides his savings, to begin life anew.

At the end of the first year's enlistment, if the recruit preferred and could pass the mental, moral and physical examinations, send him to a first class military school for one year. Then, if he could pass the examinations required for a cadet at West Point, send him for a four-year course to one of three great West Points—located on the Hudson, at or near Nashville, Tenn., and at Walla Walla, Wash.

Second, give every boy in the public and private schools over sixteen years of age a fine uniform to care for and be proud to wear, renewing it as he outgrows it, and a musket with at least ten rounds of ammunition. Organize the boys into companies, they to elect their own officers, and require that on Saturdays they shall drill and have target practice. Repeal all laws conflicting with the right of the enrolled boys as to carrying arms.

At the age of eighteen, if the boy has been in the service not less than one year and can pass the examination, send him to one of the military schools for a year's training, and, if he can pass the examination, to one of the West Points provided in the first section. Lots of these boys would drop out after a year in the military school; some would like to quit after one year at the West Point school. Let them go into private life carrying with them the education and discipline acquired, and should a war break out practically every man of them would answer the first call to arms.

Third, abolish the present system of appointing cadets to West Point, even taking from the President the right to appoint, and require that all applicants from the army or military schools must first pass a mental, moral and physical examination strict enough to show that he is a manly, well educated soldier-to-be.

Fourth, allow no details from the line until the officer has served at least three years with his company, and then not to exceed three years, and not to be renewed until he has again served three years with his company or regiment. This would break up the present system of officers being detailed away from their companies and regiments for years at a time, going from one detail to another.

The writer has served more than fifty years as an enlisted man and an officer, and knows whereof he writes when he says that it is almost impossible for an enlisted man, in the present status of affairs, to become a commissioned officer. No gamblers, drunkards or disreputables should be allowed in the army, either enlisted or commissioned. All recruiting for the army should be done by retired officers, detailed for five years and receiving full pay and allowances, not above the rank of major. U. S. ARMY, RETIRED.

Washington, June 9, 1916.

Army Service as an Opportunity

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In reference to your editorial of today "Making Army Service Worth While" may an ex-soldier say a few words?

You speak of making "military service . . . a badge of honor . . . and an economic benefit." Strangely enough, most of the men who preach preparedness do not consider it so. Take for example my own case.

When I entered the army I was a laborer. I came out a fairly efficient clerk. I received a discharge which states my character to be "excellent." I was promoted to the grade of sergeant in a branch of the service which required an examination lasting five days and covering some twelve different subjects. Of five men who passed in my department I was the highest.

I have been back in civil life now for some months. No preparedness advocate can see his way clear to employing me. Every employer whom I have interviewed has the same method. "What have you been doing?" I explain. "Well, I'll let you know if I need you." Which I understand to be his way of letting me down easily, for I have yet to hear from any of them.

My case, I know, is not an exception. Many an old soldier has said to me bitterly: "As far as civilians are concerned you're a 'bum' while you're in the army, working toward retirement; afterward you're a 'government pauper.'"

Perhaps, if some of the business men who marched in the preparedness parade would reserve positions under them for men who have honorable discharges from the army, navy or marine corps more men would be willing to enlist. EX-"NON COM."

Brooklyn, June 8, 1916.

Making Army Service Worth While.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial in Thursday's issue in reply to a letter signed "Preparedness" was read by me with great interest, some surprise and no little indignation. I wish to take exception to the statement contained therein that few men of energy, self-respect and ambition want to go into the army at present.

Rather hard language, don't you think? I have served in the United States army as an enlisted man for thirty years. During that period I learned much. I acquired a good working knowledge of the printing trade. I also learned much music and many other things that added to my self-respect and happiness. That I did not learn more was entirely my own fault. I might have been a commissioned officer had I buckled down to study.

As to "advancement to the officers' corps," it is the best in the world. All a young man has to do is to enlist, study, offer himself for the required examinations, and in the event of passing he will be commissioned a second lieutenant on a par with the West Point graduate—the finest in the world. He may also take the entrance examination for West Point on his own initiative after serving one year. Just what more he could expect would be difficult to state.

I know whereof I speak, for my son, who took this examination as a soldier, will soon be wearing the double bars of captain. There are hundreds like him in the army to-day, both active and retired, from lieutenant general to second lieutenant.

As to "class" and "democratic spirit" they must stay where they are. They are terms which qualify order and discipline, the same as exists in The Tribune office. I hardly think the chief editor invites many of the good workmen of the various departments to dine at his home. That is discipline; we may not call it "caste."

I have read The Tribune since I have been able to read anything, and cannot dispute its right to express its opinion. The army is all right and those who criticise should be equipped, not from "prevailing sentiments," but with a fair knowledge of things as they are. C. M. MILLER,

Musician (retired), U. S. A.

Highland Falls, N. Y., June 8, 1916.

[If the system of advancing enlisted men to the officers' corps were the "best in the world," there would be no need of depending for new officers as much as we do now on civilian appointments. There would be no occasion for civilian appointments if we had a real modern army. As for "caste and democracy," discipline can be easily maintained without using enlisted men for personal services that are non-military in their character.—Ed.]

"MEXICO AND PAN-AMERICANISM"

The Dominican Republic Another Test of Mr. Wilson's Sincerity.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have read your excellent leader of Monday, entitled "Mexico and Pan-Americanism," and think that it gives, with an accuracy not often found in the press of this country, a just impression of the attitude of Latin America as regards the interference of the United States in its affairs. "The good faith of the Pan-American policy," as you term it, of the Wilson Administration is now to be tested. You mention three test cases: Mexico, Hayti, Nicaragua. There is a fourth just at present: Santo Domingo. There is now an intervention of the United States in the Dominican Republic, and the reasons for it are none too clear.

Nearly a month ago there was a dissension between the President of the Dominican Republic and his Secretary of War. The armed support of the United States was immediately offered to President Jiménez, but he resigned rather than force his stay in power with foreign help against his own countrymen. Notwithstanding this, and although there had been no fighting, American forces were landed in the city of Santo Domingo. The government of the country passed into the hands of a group of secretaries of Jiménez, and Congress, in accordance with the constitution, began to elect a Provisional President.

The American Minister said at first that the American forces had landed in order that the election might be made under no constraint. Afterward, however, he opposed the continuance of the election, and, as there are no Dominican forces in the city to resist the American ships and men, Congress has been compelled to submit to this anomalous veto.

Since then the American forces have stayed there, under the pretext that "there is no peace in the country." Last week more forces were landed, not without friction, at other ports. The majority of the American public hears very little of this, as the intervention in Santo Domingo includes an American "censorship" of telegraphic news.

The preservation of peace in the country is invoked as the pretext for this intervention. It had already been the pretext of nearly all the measures taken by the United States in relation to the Dominican Republic during the last few years—especially for the 1907 convention and its consequences. However, they have most signally failed to preserve the peace. In spite of all the governmental boasts here, it is a frequent opinion among Latin-Americans that the interference of the United States, diplomatic or otherwise, has always tended to foster revolutionary disturbances among us. In the case of the Dominican Republic it is really difficult to see how a mere "convention" between the two countries for the settlement of foreign debts could be the instrument of peace.

In the present situation, the reasons given for the American intervention could not be vaguer nor its good results less evident. But for the people of Santo Domingo the reasons appear clear enough: they know that the United States is trying to obtain the absolute control of the Caribbean Sea, and that the Wilson Administration, in spite of its rhetorical utterances on the subject, thinks little of violating the territorial sovereignty of smaller countries. They are aware, also, that there may be even pettier motives: they know that, although Mr. Bryan is absent from the government, during the last year the Wilson Administration has insisted on obtaining control of all the sources of revenue in the republic in order to give employment to "deserving Democrats." Employment to be paid, of course, with Dominican money, and to be secured, it seems, even with shedding of blood.

May I add that, as the records in the State Department at Washington will show, hardly ever have American lives or property suffered from the revolutionary disturbances in the Dominican Republic? P. H. URENA.

New York, June 6, 1916.

We did not refer to the Dominican Republic as a test of President Wilson's professions of Pan-Americanism, because the present situation in that republic was not created by him. It is an inheritance from earlier administrations.—Ed.]